

FAX 703 308 7382  
 FORWARD TO: Jeane-Marquette Goodwin  
 TO

599  
 Application/Control Number 09/900/599  
 Art Unit 2841/TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

DRAFT  
 call back NO.  
 T. BRYANT  
 561-308-4506

Jeane-Marquette Goodwin  
 Dear Examiner David Martin:

Please accept the following changes and corrections as they apply to the informalities presented:

#### Claim Objections

Claim 1-4 changes as follows:

- a. Claim 1, line 5: delete "the slides," add: "reforming flexible area of polymer housing"
- b. Claim 1, lines 5 and 7: delete; "the flexilbe shape": add: self-reforming flexible area of polymer housing"
- c. Claim 1, line 8; and claim 4, lines 1-2: delete; "it's original shape": add: the self-reformable polymer housing"
- d. Claim 2, line 2: delete: "to run quickly run through", add: "to pass through the chambers at a faster speed than normally allowed by prior art"
- e. Claim 2, line 1; claim 3, line 1; and claim 4, line 1: delete: -the step of-, add: "comprising of the step of" to better claim the invention.
- f. Claim 3, line 1: delete "comprising of forming an basic or similar shape", add: "comprising of forming a basic, or similar shape"
- g. Claim 4, line 1: delete: "comprising of the flexibility of the hour-glass shape", add: "like the shape of an hourglass"

With the concept of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for obviousness for rejections set forth by the Office action, the following is a rebuttable of the obviousness that the present invention is and was not obvious to one having ordinary skills as a whole of the patentability and uniqueness so that the subject matter pertaining would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art. The following is an attempt to show that the unique of the present invention is of such a nature that it stands as subject matter that all claim rejection as cited references will be obvious to one skilled in the art and each prior application will be refuted as follows:

With the understanding that all patents are granted according to there uniqueness, such as the paperclip; though flexible wiring that achieved the one function, further patents were granted due to the pressure points in which the wiring was shaped, though having the same basic function, but different construction.

Reference: Pat # 5,023,582 Mikels, though having a flexilbe transparent plastic comprising of a first and second chamber as described, it is obvious that the main function was not involved with the housing itself as being the complete functional method of the invention, rather the *sleeve, sockets and membranes*. The simple fact that Mikel's patent was granted over 12 years ago shows that there was no comparison to the new invention in metion. It is obvious that one skilled in the art would have not have found the subject matter @ similar at the time of the invention, due to the fact that the function was not centered around the direct "housing" itself as is the present invention which completely stipulates the method f r improvement encompasses the housing solely and thus, the differences are such that no person would have found the present new application as pertaining to the same method.

Further refs are being faxed as reads  
 J.K. GWS

FAX RECEIVED

OCT 31 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

BEST AVAILABLE COPY